

Act. It does exactly what it sounds like. It blocks certain Federal funds from reaching the coffers of sanctuary States. This includes States that defy Federal immigration law or that allow individuals to obtain a driver license without providing proof that they are here legally or without providing proof that they are who they claim to be. This is no small penalty, and here is why.

In 2020, our Nation had 15 States plus the District of Columbia that have decided to give illegal immigrants a valid State-issued ID, a driver license. These 15 States and DC got \$53 million in JAG grants from the Department of Justice. These are funds—these are Justice Assistance Grants that are given to local law enforcement and criminal justice projects to do what? Enforce the law. So if you are not going to enforce the law, why should you get the money? Those funds should go to entities that have said: We will abide by the rule of law. That is where those funds should go.

Now, the second bill is the Ban Birth Tourism Act. This would amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to prohibit pregnant foreigners from obtaining a temporary visitor visa they could use to enter the United States specifically for the purpose of giving birth here. Yes, you heard me right. There is a loophole in the law, in the Immigration and Nationality Act. Because of this, we have some pregnant foreigners, primarily from Russia and China, who circumvent the law, and they get a temporary visitor visa, and they come here working with some of this multimillion-dollar-a-year birth tourism industry. They get coached. They come here. They go to a facility. They give birth. The child becomes a citizen, and then they return. As I said, primarily these are wealthy Russians and wealthy Chinese.

Our citizenship is not for sale. No, indeed. It is hard-fought. It is hard-won. It is hard-kept. The American people are right to expect better than this. Tennesseans want to see something done about this. That is why I, once again, have filed this legislation.

The American people are not unreasonable. They do not lack compassion. They just don't understand why officials who are charged with upholding the law would act in their official capacity to undermine something as basic as border security, as basic as national security.

We have a lot of security moms out there who understand that it is no small task keeping things secure at home. All of these security moms out there know that there are plenty of threats online—threats that they cannot see, but they know that there are a lot of these threats that come into their homes and onto their computer screens and onto the devices of their children because of a lack of privacy online.

How we curate and protect our virtual use, as I call it, is critically im-

portant because it defines who we are to the people who we do not see in person. And as I mentioned earlier, more of our functional and transactional life is now online. So tomorrow, to mark National Data Privacy Day, I will once again reintroduce the BROWSER Act.

Mr. President, as you and I served in the House together, I know you remember how I would introduce this bill, the BROWSER Act, to secure online privacy for millions of Americans. Now, at its heart, this is an effort to inject awareness, transparency, and accountability into the relationship between technology platforms and their users.

This legislation sets up a very basic Federal compliance framework that tech companies can use as a guide to update their privacy policies online, make it something that is going to give you the ability to say: This is information that I want to share.

It would require companies to secure an opt-in from consumers before collecting their sensitive data. And for less sensitive information, you, the consumer, would have the ability to opt out and not share that browsing history with that company.

Companies would not be able to deny you service if you want to practice your right to privacy. That makes common sense. It happens in the physical space every single day, and it should also be a right reserved to the individual in the virtual space.

This also would put the Federal Trade Commission, our online privacy regulator, in charge of watching what is happening in the virtual space, applying these rules equally across the entire internet ecosystem. A right to privacy, being secure in our communities and our homes, is something that not only Tennesseans but millions of Americans are wanting to see.

TRIBUTE TO HEATH HUCKABAY

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, this week Team Blackburn is saying goodbye to Heath Huckabee, who came to us last January as part of a fellowship program between my office and the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which is located in Oak Ridge, just outside of Knoxville, TN.

It has been an interesting year to say the least, but Heath has risen to the occasion and impressed each and every one of us with his breadth of knowledge and his ability to adapt to the hectic pace of life in the Senate. We did our best to persuade him to stay with us a little longer, but I am confident that his colleagues at Oak Ridge will be happy to see him return, as well as his wife Emily and little Elliot. They are looking forward to having him home.

It was an honor working with him this past year. We will miss him, and we wish him all the best as he heads back to Tennessee.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADVICE AND CONSENT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, the Senate is focused on one of its constitutional roles right now, which is meeting with and discussing with the new Biden administration's Cabinet—our advice and consent role. The consent role, obviously, is confirmation votes here on the floor of the U.S. Senate, which we are doing a number of these on the floor and in committee. But there is also the advice role, given to us by the Founding Fathers. On the advice, we are providing whether we vote for some of these nominees or not to the Cabinet. It is a big part of the Senate's role. So I am going to take a minute to provide a little bit of advice to some of the new, incoming Biden team.

Now, look, we are seeing it particularly in the foreign policy realm. A lot of the Biden team has actually come from the Obama-Biden team—maybe too many. You worry about stale thinking, because when they were in power 4 years ago, or a little bit over 4 years ago, there are a lot of things that have changed in the world—particularly on foreign policy, a lot that has happened in the world. So you need fresh views, but we are where we are.

But an example of this kind of stale thinking that I was shocked to see recently at the White House is the use of the term “strategic patience” as a foreign policy concept. Now, this was the phrase the Obama administration used to describe its policy toward North Korea, and I think most people would recognize—Democrats and Republicans—that that was not a very successful policy, a pretty failed policy.

Now, granted, North Korea is difficult. There is no doubt. But the policy that was known as strategic patience was the policy that enabled the North Korea rogue regime to massively build up a nuclear arsenal. So kind of like leading from behind, the Obama administration's term “strategic patience” became synonymous with a passive and even weak foreign policy approach as it related to North Korea, certainly.

So I was very surprised yesterday to hear the White House Press Secretary trot out this term again, “strategic patience,” but this time when talking about the Biden administration's policy with regard to China.

Now, this is almost certainly music to China's ears—the leadership of China—because it is kind of a subtle green light to Xi Jinping and the other authoritarians in China of its failure to uphold promise after promise to the United States—something I refer to as

“promise fatigue” that we have here—or continuing to call itself a developing country, when it is not, or continuing its attempts to dominate the South China Sea with the militarization of that important strategic sea lane, or continuation of intellectual property theft, or all the challenges that we have with China. The idea that we are going to have strategic patience, I think, sends a signal to the Chinese that we don’t take these issues urgently, and that is the wrong message. These are urgent issues.

In my discussions during the confirmation process and in hearings with now-Secretary of Defense Austin and Secretary of State Blinken, I sensed they had a sense of urgency. As a matter of fact, they both acknowledged that the previous administration—the Trump administration’s national security strategy, national defense strategy that says we need to turn to great power competition, with China as the pacing threat for the United States, they agreed with.

Even in General Austin’s—now-Secretary Austin’s—confirmation hearing, one of my colleagues, Senator BLACKBURN, actually said this term, “strategic patience,” doesn’t seem to be the right term and pressed him on it.

So here is some continued advice. In the Senate’s role, in terms of our constitutional role of advice and consent, words matter, especially from the White House podium. We need a strong, bipartisan, and lasting China policy from the United States of America. This is the biggest geostrategic issue we will be facing as a country for the next 50 to 100 years, but it is also a challenge that is here and now, a challenge that needs immediate action. So here is my advice: Ditch the “strategic patience” phrase.

The vast majority of the Senators in this body, Democrats and Republicans, want to know the Biden administration is focused on this challenge now. It is a serious challenge that China poses to the United States now, and “strategic patience” sends the wrong message to the Senate, to the American people, and to China’s leadership. So they need to do better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, let me express my gratitude to the Senator from Alaska for his words. I could not have said it better than he did, and I am grateful to him for coming and articulating that important message so clearly and emphatically.

Chris Wray, the FBI Director, is a pretty laid-back guy. As a matter of fact, I frequently tell people he reminds me of the typical G-man—you know, not a lot of emotion, not a lot of animation. But the FBI Director, who I think is doing an outstanding job and has been doing an outstanding job, gets positively animated when it comes to China and the threats presented there. Of course, the FBI is principally in

charge of the counterintelligence mission against foreign countries like China that try to steal our intellectual property, spy on our country using a number unconventional means. I just want to say to our friend from Alaska: Thank you for making that point. It is really, really important.

NOMINATION OF ANTONY JOHN BLINKEN

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, yesterday afternoon we confirmed another one of President Biden’s Cabinet nominees. Antony Blinken has led an impressive career in the public sector and is well versed in both the vast responsibilities of the State Department, as well as the diplomatic challenges we will face in the months and years ahead, the most important of which is China, but it is not China alone.

While Mr. Blinken and I have policy differences—some of them very serious—I have confidence in his ability to represent our Nation on the global stage. It is important for a new President, whether they be a Republican or a Democrat, to have qualified, Senate-confirmed officials in their Cabinet without delay.

Over the past week, we have worked to confirm nominees for some of the most critical Federal Departments and Agencies. The Secretaries of State, Defense, Treasury, as well as the Director of National Intelligence, have each been confirmed by the Senate with broad bipartisan support. And we will continue to process more of the President’s nominees in the days ahead.

Four years ago, our Democratic colleagues approached President Trump’s nominees with a grab bag of antics, including everything from intentional delays to brazen theatrics. In most cases, this behavior wasn’t a reflection on the nominee or their qualifications, but of our colleagues’ antipathy toward President Trump.

Clearly we are adopting a different approach, and I hope it is one that will deescalate these battles and one that will serve the national interest rather than harm it.

Throughout my time in the Senate, I have tried to evaluate nominees based on their qualifications, their integrity, and their ability to carry out the responsibilities for the job they have been nominated for, and I will continue to either support or oppose nominees based on those merits and those criteria, not based on the party of the President.

NEW START

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, we know it has been the tradition of the Senate to prioritize nominees for national security positions, and there has never been a more critical time to ensure that President Biden is surrounded by an experienced and capable team. From the threats posed by an increasingly hostile Iran to those by an

unpredictable North Korea, there are many, many challenges on the horizon.

One of the first the administration must confront is the expiration of the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, also known as New START. This is the only remaining bilateral strategic arms agreement between the United States and Russia, which are the world’s most powerful nuclear states, and it is set to expire in a matter of days.

Last fall, the Trump administration advocated for a 1-year extension of New START, with the condition that both countries would cap nuclear weapons—nuclear warheads during that period.

Unsurprisingly, Russia preferred a clean, 5-year extension with no warhead limitations. President Putin delayed the final stages of talks in the hopes that the potential Biden administration would strike a deal more favorable to Russia. And it appears now, at least as things stand today, that President Putin has hedged his bets correctly.

Following a call yesterday between President Biden and President Putin, the White House announced that the United States and Russia are set to extend New START for 5 years, with no conditions attached. This was President Biden’s first major foreign policy test, and, unfortunately, he played right into Russia’s hand.

For starters, it is no secret that New START was deeply flawed from the beginning. And it is no secret that Russia cheats, which is why verification is so essential.

The counting mechanisms in New START don’t effectively keep our countries on a level playing field, which is the primary goal of any arms treaty because it promotes mutual deterrents. The treaty limits the number of bombers each nation could possess but places no limit on the number of warheads each bomber can support. Making matters worse, the limits only apply to strategic, not tactical, nuclear weapons. Russia has taken advantage of this loophole in New START, amassing some 2,000 tactical nuclear weapons compared to only 500 for the United States.

Russia’s nuclear doctrine signals its increasing willingness to use those tactical nuclear weapons in a conflict, particularly in Europe, as it warily eyes NATO. Another 5 years under New START will allow Russia to continue growing its arsenal of tactical weapons and cement its advantage over the United States, perhaps permanently.

Once that happens, the likelihood of Russia deploying and ultimately using these weapons goes higher. These treaties ought to make the world safer, not a more dangerous place due to imbalances, the potential for mistakes, or miscalculation.

Beyond sheer numbers, there is also the question of trust or, I should say, of verification, because it is hardly controversial to say Russia isn’t the most trustworthy partner. Last fall,